

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants propose to amend claims 1 and 9. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 remain pending in this application

In the Final Office Action ("Office Action"), the Examiner took the following actions:

rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,661) in view of *Wagner* et al. (U.S. Patent Publication N.O. 2003/0078830) and further in view of *Kukkai* (U.S. Patent No. 7,124,355);

rejected claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* in view of *Wagner* and further in view of *Kukkai* and further in view of *Anuff* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628);

rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* in view of *Wagner*;

rejected claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* in view of *Wagner* and further in view of *Anuff*; and

rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* and *Wagner* in view of *Kukkai*.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections of claims 1-7 and 9-16. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. Such an analysis should be made explicit and cannot be premised upon mere conclusory statements. See *M.P.E.P.* § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (Sept. 2007). " A conclusion of obviousness

requires that the reference(s) relied upon be enabling in that it put the public in possession of the claimed invention." *M.P.E.P.* § 2145. Furthermore, "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art" at the time the invention was made. *M.P.E.P.* § 2143.01 (III), *internal citation omitted*. Moreover, "[i]n determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious." *M.P.E.P.* § 2141.02(1), *internal citations omitted* (emphasis in original).

"[T]he framework for objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q 459 (1966).... The factual inquiries ... [include determining the scope and content of the prior art and] ... [a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art." *M.P.E.P.* § 2141(11). "Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art." *M.P.E.P.* § 2141(11).

Independent claim 1 recites a method including "presenting, in the personal workspace, a first view including at least one task associated with a first workset, wherein the first workset is associated with a first work role of the user," "presenting, in the personal workspace, a second view including at least one task associated with a second workset, wherein the second workset is associated with a second work role of the user," and "presenting, in the personal workspace, a third view including the at least one task associated with the first workset associated with the first work role of the user

and the at least one task associated with the second workset associated with the second work role of the user." *Polizzi, Wagner, Kuklai, and Anuff*, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least these claimed features for the following reasons.

The Office Action appears to allege that the "role portal component" recited on [0009] of *Wagner* discloses "a second work role of the user," as recited in claim 1. Office Action, page 2. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that *Wagner* discloses that "[the] role portal component provides at least two respective role portals that correspond to at least two marketing roles within the marketing organization (for example, marketing executive, marketing manager, data analyst, etc.)." *Id.* This is incorrect.

Wagner discloses "provid[ing] unique user displays for the marketing organization's computer system." Paragraph [0009]. Specifically, *Wagner* discloses that "[a] role portal component provides **at least two** respective role portals that correspond to at least two marketing roles within the marketing organization (for example, marketing executive, marketing manager, data analyst, etc.)." *Id.*

Further, *Wagner* discloses that **"each user has a role associated with the portal file.**

As such, their portal will have a default design that meets the needs of users fulfilling the role that the user serves in the marketing organization." Paragraph [0024].

(Emphasis added). That is, *Wagner* discloses using a portal component to support multiple users within a marketing organization. Each user in *Wagner*, however, is associated with a role in the marketing organization, including, for example, marketing executive, marketing manager, and data analyst. Thus, in *Wagner*, using a portal component to support multiple users within a marketing organization does not constitute

or suggest "presenting, in the personal workspace, a first view including at least one task associated with a first workset, wherein the first workset is associated with a **first work role of the user**" and "presenting, in the personal workspace, a second view including at least one task associated with a second workset, wherein the second workset is associated with a **second work role of the user**," as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Additionally, *Wagner* does not disclose "presenting, in the personal workspace, a third view including the at least one task associated with the first workset associated with the first work role of the user and the at least one task associated with the second workset associated with the second work role of the user," as further recited in claim 1. As established above, in *Wagner*, each user in *Wagner* is associated with one role in the marketing organization. Therefore, *Wagner* does not disclose or suggest "presenting, in the personal workspace, a third view including the at least **one task associated with the first workset associated with the first work role** of the user and the at least **one task associated with the second workset associated with the second work role** of the user," as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Polizzi, *Kukkai*, and *Anuff* do not compensate for the deficiencies of *Wagner*. The Office Action alleges that *Polizzi* teaches generating information views (Office Action, pg. 3); *Kukkai* teaches navigating back to the execution level page (Office Action, pg. 5); and *Anuff* teaches control level pages including messages and work triggers. (Office Action, pg. 6). Even if these allegations are correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Polizzi*, *Kukkai*, and *Anuff*, taken either individually or in combination, still do not teach or suggest the above discussed claimed features of "a second work

role of the user." Therefore, *Polizzi, Wagner, Kukukai*, and *Anuff* do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1.

Independent claim 9, while differing in scope, recites elements similar to those of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, the rejection of the independent claim should be withdrawn for similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 10-16 depend from independent claims 1 and 9. The rejections of the dependent claims are improper and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependence.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Reply should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Reply would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the Reply would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Reply, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 12, 2010

By: /Jiayu Song/

Jiayu Song
Ltd. Rec. No. L0500
(202) 408-4000